(2) I.e., the two Rabbis should have stated their views on this case also.
(3) Since he could not contain himself till he finished. Lit., 'rejected'. Cur. edd. add 'and he is unfit', which is omitted in MS.M.
(4) Amos. IV, 12. Interpreted to mean, Put thyself in a fit state to meet etc.
(5) Eccl. IV, 17.
(6) Eccl. IV, 17.
(7) Ibid.
(8) Ibid. This is the literal rendering; E.V. 'for they know not that they do evil'.
(9) This is an alternative rendering of the word ragleka (thy foot) which is taken in the same sense as in I Sam. XXIV, 4.
(10) Where there is already excrement.
(11) The privies in Babylon were out in the fields.
(12) V. MS.M.
(13) I.e., wind the straps round them.
(14) It was customary to wear the tefillin the whole of the day and take them off at night-time.
(15) A bag of this size would protect them from uncleanness.
(16) With a tight fitting cover. V. Num. XIX, 15.
(17) Even if they are less than one handbreadth in size.
(18) To hold them to one's hand.

Talmud - Mas. Berachoth 23b

they will protect me.[1] Raba said: When we were following R. Nahman, if he had a book of Aggada he used to give it to us, but if he was wearing tefillin he did not give them to us, saying, since the Rabbis have permitted them, they will guard me.

Our Rabbis taught: A man should not hold tefillin in his hand or a scroll of the Law in his arm while saying the Tefillah,[2] nor should he make water while wearing them, nor sleep in them, whether a regular sleep or a short snatch. Samuel says: A knife, money, a dish and a loaf of bread are on the same footing as tefillin.[3] Raba said in the name of R. Shesheth: The law is not in accordance with this Baraitha,[4] since it expresses the view of Beth Shammai. For seeing that Beth Hillel declare it permissible in a regular privy [to hold the tefillin] is there any question that they would permit it in an ad hoc privy?

An objection was raised: The things which I have permitted to you in the one place I have forbidden to you in the other. Presumably this refers to tefillin. Now if you say the Baraitha quoted follows Beth Hillel, there is no difficulty. 'I have permitted it to you in the one place' — the regular privy, 'and I have forbidden it to you in the other' — the ad hoc privy. But if you say it is Beth Shammai, they do not permit anything! — That statement[5] refers to the baring of the handbreadth and two handbreadths, as one [Baraitha] taught: When a man eases himself, he may bare a hand breadth behind and two handbreadths in front, and another taught: a handbreadth behind and in front not at all. Is it not the case that both statements refer to a man, and there is no contradiction, the former referring to easing and the latter to making water? But do you think so? If for making water, why a handbreadth behind? Rather both refer to easing, and there is no contradiction, the one referring to a man and the other to a woman. If that is the case,[6] what of the succeeding statement, 'This is an a fortiori which cannot be rebutted'? What is the point of 'which cannot be rebutted'? This[7] is merely the natural way! We must say therefore that tefillin are referred to [in the Baraitha], and it is a refutation of what Raba said in the name of R. Shesheth. — It is a refutation. Still a difficulty remains: If it is permissible in a regular privy, how much more so in an ad hoc privy! — What it means is this: In a regular privy where there is no splashing, it is permitted; in an ad hoc privy where there is splashing,[8] it is forbidden. If that is the case, how can you say, 'which cannot be rebutted'? There is an excellent refutation? — What it means is this: This[9] rule is based upon a reason[10] and not upon an argument a fortiori; for if we were to employ here an argument a fortiori,[11]